



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,320	10/17/2005	John L. Schenk	XY-Optimum-USNP	6962
33549 7590 04/01/2009 SANTANGELO LAW OFFICES, P.C. 125 SOUTH HOWES, THIRD FLOOR FORT COLLINS, CO 80521				
EXAMINER				
GOUGH, TIFFANY MAUREEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1657				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

BarbH@idea-asset.com

CherylS@idea-asset.com

SantangelolawOfficesPTOnotices@yahoo.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,320

Applicant(s)

SCHENK ET AL.

Examiner

TIFFANY M. GOUGH

Art Unit

1657

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 148-154 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 148-154 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/22/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response filed 1/12/2009 and IDS' filed 1/22/2009 have been received and entered into the case. Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 148-154 are pending and have been considered on the merits. All arguments and amendments have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 148,149,152,153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. While being enabled independently for obtaining a semen sample, incubating at various temperatures, staining at 30 and 60 minutes using various concentrations of Hoechst 33342, using the method of hysteroscopic insemination, does not reasonably provide enablement for practicing the claimed method including claimed concentrations, method steps, etc. in combination with staining for 30 minutes. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicant does not describe incubating semen at a temperature between 5-25°C, **staining with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes**, separating sperm

cells to provide an about 72% pregnancy rate and using with hysteroscopic insemination. Applicant does not describe incubating semen at a temperature between 5-25°C, staining 50×10^6 sperm/ml with a concentration of Hoechst 33342 between about 2.6-3.9 μl **for a period of 30 minutes**. Applicant does not describe incubating semen at a temperature between 5-25C, staining 150×10^6 and 450×10^6 sperm/ml with a concentration of Hoechst 33342 between about 7.8-23.4 μl **for a period of 30 minutes**. The combination of these features is not found in applicants specification. Applicants closest disclosure resides in Examples 5-7, however, the combination of claimed ranges, concentrations, pregnancy rates and insemination methods are not disclosed, nor is there any disclosed advantage of the claimed permutation. Undisclosed advantages are given little or no weight.

Undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as claimed due to the quantity of experimentation necessary to achieve the claimed results, limited amount of guidance and limited number of working examples in the specification having the combination of staining time and concentrations, ranges, method steps; nature of the invention; state of the prior art; predictability or unpredictability in the art; and breadth of the claims. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claims 148, 149, 152 and 153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant does not describe incubating semen at a temperature between 5-25°C, **staining with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes**, separating sperm cells to provide an about 72% pregnancy rate and using with hysteroscopic insemination. Applicant does not describe incubating semen at a temperature between 5-25°C, staining 50×10^6 sperm/ml with a concentration of Hoechst 33342 between about 2.6-3.9 μl **for a period of 30 minutes**. Applicant does not describe incubating semen at a temperature between 5-25°C, staining 150×10^6 and 450×10^6 sperm/ml with a concentration of Hoechst 33342 between about 7.8-23.4 μl **for a period of 30 minutes**. The combination of these features is not found in applicants specification. Applicants closest disclosure resides in Examples 5-7, however, the combination of claimed ranges, concentrations, pregnancy rates and insemination methods are not disclosed, nor is there any disclosed advantage of the combinations. Undisclosed advantages are given little or no weight. Therefore, the amendments to claim 1 and new claims 148, 149, 152 and 153 change the scope of the claims and applicants invention for which no support is provided. **This is a new matter rejection.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 151-154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of each of WO 02/41906 A2 and WO 01/37655 A1 in view of each of Tardif et al. (Journal of Andrology, 1998) and Ellington (US 6140121) supported by Padilla et al (Journal of Animal Science, 1991).

WO'906 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.9, lines 11-18), incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C, particularly 17-19°C (p.3, lines 28-33, all of p.4, p.5, lines 1-5), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic,

separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO'906 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step, the use of an extender (p. 9, lines 1-33, all of p. 10) and antibacterial (Table 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (p.11, lines 21-28, p. 15, lines 10—18) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (p.16, lines 1-15, p.18,lines 30-33, example 2, Table 2, Example 3,4,5).

WO'655 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.2, lines 20-32) incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C (p.10, lines 10-25), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO '655 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step (p.3), the use of an extender (p.7) and antibiotics (p.9, lines 25-33, Example 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (Example 2,3) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (examples 2, 3).

The above references do not teach staining for a period of 30 minutes

Tardif teaches staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes (p. 202, Experiment 1, 2, Results section).

The above references do not teach adding caffeine to semen.

Ellington teaches the addition of caffeine to semen (col. 5, lines 44-46).

The references do not teach the specific extenders KMT and INRA96. However, they do teach that proper extenders are well known to those skilled in the art and therefore one of skill in the art would choose a proper extender depending on the mammal. KMT and INRA extenders are known in the art to be proper equine extenders, as supported by Padilla, who teach the use of KMT and INRA extenders for stallion semen at about 5°C.

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the use a proper semen extender known in the art depending on the mammal.

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have stained sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes with a reasonable expectation for successfully maintaining sperm motility because Tardif teaches that staining for a period of 30 minutes does not depress sperm motility. Further it would have been obvious to add caffeine to a semen sample as caffeine is well known in the art to be a sperm stimulant.

Further, adjusting the staining time period, dye concentration and amount of sperm cells stained would be well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as a mere optimization of a result effective variable. Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are

disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%.); see also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."). See MPEP 2144.05.

Claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21, 148,149,150,152-154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of each of WO 02/41906 A2 and WO 01/37655 A1 in view of Tardif et al. (Journal of Andrology, 1998) in further view of each of WO 02/28311 A1and Lindsey et al (ARS, 2001).

WO'906 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.9, lines 11-18), incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C, particularly 17-19°C (p.3, lines 28-33, all of p.4, p.5, lines 1-5), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO'906 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step, the use of an extender

(p. 9, lines 1-33, all of p. 10) and antibacterial (Table 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (p.11, lines 21-28, p. 15, lines 10—18) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (p.16, lines 1-15, p.18, lines 30-33, example 2, Table 2, Example 3,4,5).

WO'655 teaches a method of separating sperm cells comprising obtaining a semen sample from a male mammal, particularly a bovine or equine mammal (p.2, lines 20-32) incubating the semen sample at temperatures ranging from 5-25°C (p.10, lines 10-25), for a time period between 1-18 hours, determining a characteristic of the sperm cells, such as a sex characteristic, separating and collecting the sperm cells. WO '655 further teaches transporting the semen from one location to another during the incubation step (p.3), the use of an extender (p.7) and antibiotics (p.9, lines 25-33, Example 1), staining the sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 (Example 2,3) and separating the sperm cells using a flow cytometer (examples 2, 3).

The above references do not teach staining for a period of 30 minutes

Tardif teaches staining sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes (p. 202, Experiment 1, 2, Results section).

The above references do not teach hysteroscopic insemination.

WO 311 teaches the use of hysteroscopic insemination in combination with sex-sorted sperm stained with Hoechst 33342 (p. 10, lines 14-22) as well as increased fertilization rates (p.15, lines 3-20).

Lindsey teach a pregnancy rate of 70-90% for hysteroscopic insemination in combination with sex-sorted sperm stained with Hoechst 33342 (p.281, p. 286) as well as a skim-milk glucose extender.

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have stained sperm cells with Hoechst 33342 for a period of 30 minutes with a reasonable expectation for successfully maintaining sperm motility because Tardif teaches that staining for a period of 30 minutes does not depress sperm motility. Further it would have been obvious to use hysteroscopic insemination because it is disclosed in the art by WO'311 and Lindsey to be an effective insemination method in combination with sex-sorted sperm.

Further, adjusting the staining time period, dye concentration and amount of sperm cells stained would be well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as a mere optimization of a result effective variable. Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges

by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%.); see also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."). See MPEP 2144.05.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-12, 15, 16, 18, 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIFFANY M. GOUGH whose telephone number is (571)272-0697. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ralph Gitomer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1657

/Tiffany M Gough/
Examiner, Art Unit 1657